

# A LETTER

sent  
FROM A PRIVATE  
GENTLEMAN TO A  
FRIEND IN LONDON,

In justification of his owne adhering  
to His MAJESTIE in these  
times of Distraction:

*With*

Arguments inducing him thereunto, both  
from the Law of GOD and Man.



Printed for William Webb. Ann. Dom. 1642.



A  
LETTER OF LOYALTY,  
with Arguments induceing thereun-  
to, from the Lawes of God and Man.

Sir,



Have receiv'd your Letter, and the Newes you sent me; though I have either seene or heard it all before, yet I give you many thanks for it. I would that either there were lesse newes, or better stirring. In your last letter I received nothing but chiding, invectives. I wish you to examine your selfe how farre the profession of so much faith (as those of your opinion are full of) can stand with so little charity, as their censoriousnesse of others expresse. I know charity is the touch-stone of faith. And the Apostle tells me, *Love thinketh no evil*, unlesse it be sufficiently proved. For my part I judge no man, I leave every one to himselfe to stand or fall. I may be seriously sorry for some, but I will peremptorily censure none. It shall be my indeavour to settle mine owne conscience, and to that end I shall impartially embrace all opportunities, that may either convince my conscience if corrupt, or confirme it if upright; and this taske being accomplished, I shall march on with comfort and cheerfulness (though thorough the sharpest thicket of difficulties and reproach) to that period which my conscience shall point me to. And the name of a Parliament without the true subsistence of it will no more awe me, then the naked stile of a King left my Sovereigne without due honour attending it can please him. Venerable I canesse the name of a Parliament, but that is where the nature accompanieth it;

it; for otherwise it is but an empty shadow without a body: And I would willingly be satisfied, whether the place where the Parliament sits, or the persons sitting in that place be the essentiall part of a true Parliament. I conceive certainly that not the place, but the persons make the Parliament; and then to admit the King no part of it (which cannot with truth be admitted;) the truest definition of a Parliament I can frame to my selfe is, that it is *A company or assembly of select persons, chosen by the free votes of the Freeholders of each County, and Freemen of each Borough, (warranted to make such election by the Kings especiall Writ) and by them intrusted to represent the affections, and act the duties of them who so chose them.* This I thinke being not to be denied for truth, it will follow that all this elect body must agree in one; or else the majority of voyces agreeing must carry it, and oblige the minority disagreeing. This being also I thinke unquestionable, I see not why the majority of number, both of the House of Peeres and Commons, who by their attendance on, and obedience to the King, together with the removall of themselves for the minority residing behinde expresse their votes, their resolves what they are; ought not rather in the true nature, and fundamentall essence of the thing, be honoured, knowne, and meant by the stile of Parliament, the great Councell of the King, and the representative body of the Kingdome; then that minor part so much cryed up, and doted on by the Idolatizers thereof. And if there may be any colour to deny this premisse; yet I see no shift to avoyde this consequent, but that it will be an inevitable conclusion, That if the majority of number of Peeres, and Parliament men which now adhere to the King may erre and be malignant, that then certainly the Votes of the majority of the representative body of the Kingdome may be erroneous, and so consequently ought not to oblige. And if the majority of voyces may, much more may the minority fall into this unhappinesse to be lyable to errors, and therefore can lesse claime obedience as a due unto them. If it be finally the residing alone in *Westminster* that gives them their infallibility, I see not but the Popes chaire may give as good right, and make as just a claime to that priviledge. But the much experience of many former Parliaments kept in severall places of this Kingdome evidenceth sufficiently, that no such Prerogative is by nature of Parliament entayled upon *Westminster*.

Consider secondly, that these men are chosen but by Subjects, and therefore are but to represent the affections, and act the duties of Sub-

jects; and are indeed but the representative body of Subjects: and how can it stand then with this condition, that they should impose a law, command, or rule upon their Sovereigne? if they will transcend this condition, they breake the limits of all such trust as either was, or could be conferred upon them: For the Subjects that chose them, had not that power of commanding their Sovereigne in themselves, to conferre upon them. And *Nihil dat quod non habet.*

Thirdly, we know by the fundamentall constitution of Parliaments, the King hath in himselfe the power to dissolve them; much more hath he the power in himselfe to deny any thing propounded by them: for the power of dissolving is greater then of denying. Now that hee hath in himselfe the power of dissolving, the very Act of continuance of this Parliament is a sufficient prooffe, which otherwise had beene idle, and the passing it by Act had beene in the Parliament-men a betraying of the trust reposed in them, and of their owne Priviledges, had they had the power of continuance in themselves, without the Kings assent. Now if this Act of continuance passed by the King was an Act of favour, grace, and trust, let them take heed that it be not abused by them against the King, and so free him before God and man from all blame in the using all possible meanes, at least lawfull meanes to reassume that power and trust into his owne hands, which being but lent out hath been so mis-employed against him. For certainly if I convey my estate in trust to any friend, to the use and behoofe of me and mine, and the person so trusted falsifie the faith so reposed in him, by converting the profits and benefit of my estate to sinister ends, to the prejudice of me and mine, no man will thinke it unlawfull for me, if it be possible, to annihilate such deed of trust.

Now if the King have fundamentally in himselfe the power of denying such things as shall be propounded by them to him, it followeth that their Votes without his Majesties assent to them are not binding, nor exact obedience unto them: and so all these high Votes of the Houses fall to the ground as invalid.

Lastly, adde hereunto that the King must needs be reputed part of the Parliament, which by supposition was in the beginning waved, but a thing alwayes to be acknowledged for a truth; then if the Parliament without the King make the representative body, the King is the reall head to that body of the Kingdome; and it were as absurd as monstrous to exclude the head from acting any thing that should generally

nerally concerne the body, since from the head the spirits are derived, which give both sence and motion to the whole body; and that body which will separate it selfe from the head, may please it selfe with the fancy of independency; but the conclusion will leave it a dead, uselesse, and neglected trunke.

And thus in brieve have I shewed you that these Votes and Orders which thunder out so much power and terror cannot properly according to the fundamentall constitution of Parliament be said to be Acted, Voted, or Ordered by Parliament, that name being due unto them, neither *à majore*, nor *à meliore parte*. And therefore that by the fundamentall Lawes of this Kingdome I conceive my selfe disoblighd from any obedience or submission to them.

Thus to prove that by humane Law I am not tyed to obey; now that by conscience I am tied not to obey these Votes and Orders of the pretended Parliament, which are to the opposition or disobedience of his Majestie. Kings we know are Gods annointed, & therefore sacred, and not to be toucht with rude hands; though their demeanour in government be never so wicked, never so unjust, yet the divine character of authority enstamped upon them giveth them an inviolable immunity from humane hands. Hence it was that *David* though himselfe anointed also by Gods appointment in the roome of *Saul* durst not injure *Saul*, but his heart smote him for the renting but the lap of *Sauls* garment, when God had delivered *Saul* into *David*s hands. And shall wee applaud our selves without remorse of conscience, when wee lay violent hands upon the fairest jewell of the Crowne of our Lords annointed, when we plucke the fairest flower of his garland from his head? Was *Saul* more sacred, more holy, more virtuous, then our *CHARLES*? Or have we more liberty, more priviledge, to disobey, to disrobe Kings of their honour then the Jewes had? or hath this Parliament a more wise and understanding heart, a more sincere zeale to reformation, a more sacred and divine calling then *David* had? *O then be wise yee sounes of men, be learned yee that take upon you to judge the Earth, lest the King of Kings laugh at your folly, and crush you in pieces with a rod of Iron.* O let it be a badge of Antichristianity, of that man of sinne; and odious let it be to all true zelots to exalt themselves against all that is called God. Let us feare to separate that which God hath conjoynd. Hath not hee taught both in the Old and New Testament to *Feare God, and honour the King*? and shall wee now imagine that the dishonouring the King must be the cheise

cheife evidence of our fearing of God? God forbid. Let us know *Rebellion is as the sinne of witchcraft*, most odious to God, most bewitching and enticing in it self. Shall we wonder it should appeare maskt with religion, and usherd in with pretence of reformation? Behold the father of it the Devill, when he would have tempted our Saviour to rebellion against his father, God the father came with *Scriptum est* for a preface; though hee knew his mischievous designe of heart could not lye hid from the all-seeing eyes of our Lord. How did *Absalom* court the hearts of the Israelites, when he was in hatching his odious rebellion against his father? was it not with pretence of reformation, saying, *Behold thy matter is good and just, but there is none deputed of the King to heare it. Oh that I were made Governour over this Land, how would I doe justice to all that came unto me.* And shall this policy of dazeling our purblind mortall eyes seeme now strange unto us? Nay certainly, were not the face of all these present distempers maskt with a pretence of Reformation, and vizarded with a seeming hatred of Superstition, though ayming at more horrid intentions, how could we so soon have lost and torne the unity of the faith, from the bond of peace? Do we not all beleieve in one God, worship one Trinity, rely upon one Mediatour, acknowledge one way to heaven? And shall the garbe and apparell wherein we make this voyage, the gesture whereby we worship this God, the dialect wherein we pray to this Mediatour, set us at a greater distance of affections, then if we were Pagans, Turkes, and Infidels? Doth God more delight in contentions about Ceremonies, Gestures, Words, then in the peace of his Church? or shall the wearing of a Surplice, signing with a Crosse, bowing of a knee, bee able to divorce Christ from his Spouse? God forbid. *Oh then I charge you yee daughters of Ierusalem, and you that wish well unto Sion, by the Roes and by the Hindes of the forrest, that yee awake not this his Spouse, this his Beloved, untill she please.* Oh let us not like the Dog in *Esops* fables, quarrell for the shadow, and lose the bone where the marrow is. While we seeke to purifie the Ceremony, let not the substance perish. While we would settle the Church, let us not cut the throat of the State, which is the guard of the Church. Who will powre a vessell of pure wine on the floore, because the outside of the caske is not eye-pleasing? Or cast away a boxe of rich Jewels, because the Cabinet wherein they are, suites not his fancie. *Oh then let us binde up the breaches of Sion, lest the cloud depart from betweene the Cherubims,*



*Cherubims, and the Arke fall into the hands of the uncircumcised.* Let the Magistrate settle the garbe of religion, even Kings, for they are *Custodes utriusque tabula*, and let it be religion to obey those Magistrates: God hath not given them the sword in vaine, and let not us feeble the power thereof by suffering due punishment for our disobedience. Thus shall we make Christ our example, who yielded himselfe under *Pilate*, when he could have called for legions of Angels to have rescued him, but he acknowledgeth even that power of *Pilate* so unjustly used to be given him from above, and submitted unto it. Thus shall we follow Christs precept to *Peter*, when he resisted authority, *Put up thy sword, for they that strike with the sword shall perish by the sword.* Thus shall wee tread the steps of our forefathers, the Apostles, and Fathers in the Primitive Church, who chose rather to glorifie their faith by suffering under, then resisting against the power of Magistracy, though tyrannicall. And if an Angell from Heaven (as you thinke) teach you any doctrine contrary to this of Christs, and his Apostles, let him be an *Anathema* and *accursed*. It is not the height of your zeale, if not guided with knowledge, can excuse us, for then the Jewes might have had a faire plea for their crucifying of Christ; the Apostle testifying they did it through ignorance: And yet we see what a curse hath dog'd them and their posterity to this day.

Now it thus appearing that Christianity admits not a resisting, defensive force in subjects against their Sovereigne, though never so much abusing their power, that the policie of our State, and the fundamentall constitution of our Kingdome admits not the stile of Parliament in truth to be given to the founders of these Votes and Orders, under colour whereof men presume to take Armes against their Sovereigne, and his commands.

And it being a thing knowne to all the world, that his Majesty hath given abundant satisfaction for the past unhappy accidents in his government; and so solemnly protested for the future to be guided by the knowne Lawes of the Land, and to defend the truth of Religion, the liberty of the Subject, and the Priviledges of Parliament. What shall any man plead for himselfe at the high tribunall of the Almighty, that shall dare to take weapon in hand against his annointed? let him flatter himselfe how he please with his zeale, doate as he will upon his imaginary fancie of a Parliament, thinke his infidelity in and to his Prince an argument of his faith to God; yet miserable will his end be, who

who shall perish in such an attempt, and into the congregation of them let not my soule come.

But that I may the more freely commit you to the peace of God, let mee either have the hap to satisfie you, or the liberty to expresse that which satisfieth mee, that these grand pretenders to the good of the Kingdome, are not such as seeke the peace of either state or Church, and consequently have no share in the peace of God, and therefore those that will share therein, must not have their portion with them. O how easie had it beene for them, had they sought the peace of this State, to have condescended to his Majesties gracious proposition of a Parliamentary judicature in other severall places, wherto he was contented to refer himself. Thus had the honor of a Parliament bin preserved; thus might the peace of the Kingdome have bin continued, thus the distractions of the religion settled. But what was the reason, what could be the allegation why his Majesty might not have had satisfaction herein? nothing that I have either heard or can imagine, but that they could not without hazzard to their persons remove any whither else, as they supposed. Well, admit it; which yet I thinke (had they no guilty consciences to affright themselves withall) there was no just cause to feare; these persons we see who for their owne security would not embrace a hopefull proposition of peace, will hazzard their owne persons freely in a civill warre; if their lives were all the hazzard, or by their deaths the Kingdome were endangered, is not the same on all sides as much hazarded and with more probability to be irrecoverable by the imbroylement of a civill warre, then by an indifferent condiscention of another place to have met the King in a Parliamentary way. O then let the mist be taken from our eyes, and let us discern, whether these be peacemakers or no, or whether they tread the steps of peace tak heed lest though their words be smooth as oyle, yet their throat prove not an open sepulchre: and if they perish in their owne obstinacie, yet let us not be involved in the same sinne. Let us seeke peace and ensue it, and so the God of peace will be With us; which shall ever be the prayer of

Your loving friend  
F.